



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## OLD FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Les Enseignements de Robert de Ho dits Enseignements Trebor publiés pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Paris et de Cheltenham* par MARY-VANCE YOUNG. Paris, Picard, 1901, 8<sup>vo</sup>; 176 pp.

This edition of a hitherto unpublished Anglo-Norman poem was presented in 1897 by Miss Young to the University of Zürich as a doctor's dissertation. It consists of 2904 lines, in the main octosyllabic, but with other meters interspersed at times. MS. C being very faulty, P is used as the basis of the edition except for a few passages where it is illegible or where C has additional lines, and for the last 277 lines, P being incomplete at the end. Nothing is known concerning the author except his name, which, after being given in reverse order at the beginning (Trebor), is revealed at the close as Robert de Ho. The poem is a moral disquisition consisting of a series of somewhat disconnected exhortations on worldly and spiritual subjects, in the form of counsels from a father to his son. The author himself gives a list of sources for his maxims at the beginning of the work, which the editor has verified, to the exclusion of practically all those named except Cato and the Bible. This study she has extended to a comparison, so far as practicable, with similar treatises written during the Middle Ages, giving the results in a series of foot-notes to the text which display careful reading and add no little to its value. She would have done well however to embrace Vincent de Beauvais in the list of authors thus compared. The introduction includes a detailed study of the language of MS. P and of the author. The phenomena have been carefully and intelligently collected, but their analysis is not always pursued far enough to secure a proper interpretation of the details.

As has been said, MS. C is very poor, and so P forms the necessary foundation of a critical text. Yet the editor has frequently been able to utilize C in amending the text (cf. the statement on p. 4, top). We have a right then in a critical edition to expect all the variants that C furnishes, except such as are merely graphic, to be put at our disposition in the foot-notes to the text, and the editor states that this has been done (p. 1, bot.). It

would in itself be surprising if C furnished no more variants than those there recorded, and certain remarks in the introduction show that at least in some instances the readings of C are omitted from the foot-notes. Thus the ten variant readings mentioned on pp. 3-4 are not given in the notes. Nor are we sure that we have always in the text the reading of P itself. The statement (p. 22), "*El se trouve comme sujet neutre aux v. 1372, 1663, 2333,*" indicates that the *il* we find in the constituted text is not the manuscript reading, yet the manuscript reading is not given elsewhere, and it is only incidentally, in the introduction, that we learn it is not represented by the text. If the editor has normalized the text, she should tell us what norm she follows, or else give all variations from the manuscript.—From p. 16, top, we learn that the manuscript, in l. 1937, must have *fe*, which the editor has in the text wrongly corrected to *fez*, without giving us a hint that the fault is hers and not the author's.—The manuscript reading for ll. 2167-69 is to be found only on p. 167, to which no reference is given from this passage. The reading for l. 1830 is on p. 165, this time however with a cross reference.

The principle laid down by the editor for the constitution of the text is (p. 3): "*Je n'ai corrigé dans toute l'étendue de la poème que les fautes évidentes*"—a rule that applies admirably to all editing, but the application of which depends altogether on what the individual considers as evident errors. The evidence of some of the "errors" corrected is only surface deep, and a number of passages are passed over in silence which are so manifestly corrupt that they demand discussion or at least mention.

If the glossary is intended as an aid for beginners, the greatest care should have been exercised to distinguish between well-established meanings of words and those which may be presumed to fit the passage; if for more advanced workers, then every unusual interpretation should have been accompanied by a full statement of the reasons which led to its being suggested. It would be interesting to know whether the author has in reserve supplemental lexicographical notes on a number of cases where the definition has the air of being made to order.

Page 30 contains a list of errata, to which others

may be added. The corrections there given to ll. 80, 1588 are themselves errata. P. 12, for *kis les* read *ki les*; p. 23, for *grantement* read *grantment*; line 255, read *lerres* for *erres*; 342, *par* for *per*? 664, *fet* for *et*; 780, *gent* for *gente*; 1002, *ateinz* for *ateint[s]*; p. 75, l. 4 from bot., *si che* for *sirche*; line 1230, *refrein(s)* for *refrein[s]*? cf. also p. 24, s. v. *resun*, where there evidently lurks another erratum. Line 1239 read *en grant* for *engrant*; 1250, period; 1765, sc. *E*; 1997, *d. t*; 2498, *pruz* for *ruz*; 2751, period. Read *leement* for *leë[e]ment*; 2872, *bon(e)* for *bone*. There are occasional references to the notes from passages to which no note is devoted; so ll. 2047, 2522, 2633, 2772, 2784.

INTRODUCTION. Page 13, bot. Most of the cases given for *e* = *i* belong rather under the head "*e* for *ei*," and no one of them represents a real tendency for *i* to become *e*. Thus *preant* is not for *priant*, but for *preiant*; so *lera*, *preiere*. In *pré*, *delete*, *lese*, *prese* the *e* stands for *ei*, analogical to the ending-accented forms. *devin* is due to dissimilation; *soufest* arises from a confusion with *faire*; *dez* and *el* are cases of the substitution of one word for another. Similarly *ei* in *empeirer* (p. 14) is not for *i*. *te*, 1274, might also have been cited equally well. (*preis* for *pris*, 71, 296, not mentioned by the editor, is on *preisier*.) It is a still more inexact form of statement to say that *s* final is omitted in the cases cited pp. 15-16: *fe*, imperative, is supposed to stand for *fais* (!); in *l'estoire de Bretons*, 2081, *de* is not *des*, but is due to the omission of the article with names of peoples—cf. Meyer-Lubke, *Gram.*, III, § 144; *te*, 1274, is nom. plu. mas., and should have no *s*; *au privez*, 2218, may have been originally *af privez*, then the *f* mistaken for an *l*, and the *l* written *u*.—Page 20. *au bien garder*, 1453, *del tarier*, 2281, etc., are cited as containing the pronoun *le*, and the reference to Tobler, *Vrai Aniel*, note to l. 5, is given. *Le* is not and cannot be a pronoun when it stands before the infinitive, since only the tonic form is permitted in that position. Tobler corrected his earlier statement in A. N. S. L., xxvi, 288.—Page 21. *te* in *te ai je dit*, 1027, is of course merely an additional case of scribal *e* for *ei*, the tonic form being perfectly permissible in this position.—Page 21, bot. *Lei*. The examples should be differentiated; in 2223, *lei* equals *ta viande* and so must stand for *li* obl. tonic fem. In the other

two passages it is clearly masculine, but the verb in each case is in the position which permits an atonic pronoun to follow it, and the pronoun is unemphatic, so it is better to consider *lei* as scribal for *le* rather than manufacture a tonic *lei* by proportional analogy. Judging from the editor's comments, *le(i)* should be read for *le[i]* in 2257.—Page 22, top. Is the reference to 2345 correct? If so, the remark does not apply. In this passage we are not informed whether the constituted text, which here varies from P, follows C, and if not, what the reading of C is.—Page 22. The editor's comment to *le*, 51, made, it seems, before *de le* was properly read *d'ele*, is to be struck out.

TEXT. Line 71, *Qui par cest guai[n]g n'a nul preis*. *guaing* is a scribal substitution of substantive for verb, the mistake being due to the preceding *cest*. The editor (note to l. 63) takes it for a subjunctive, but we may restore the indicative *guaigne* if we concede this reduced form for *guaaigne*, which is not in itself improbable, though l. 683 is the only passage in the poem really supporting it (l. 2398, *Fiz, ne lesse tes gaigneries*, might easily be read: *Fiz, ne lai tes guaaigneries*). The liberties taken with the diaeresis in connection with this word are manifold; cf. *guäing*, 71; *güeneras*, 1210; *guaing*, 1290, 1293; *gu[a]aignier*, 1518; *gua[a]igneras*, 2322; *gaaigne*, 2403. The correct form is of course *guaai-*. Lack of system in the use of the diaeresis is not limited to this word. *poez* = *pöez*, 1999, etc.; *poez* = *poez*, 214, etc.; so *loer* = *löer*, *oez* = *öez*, 238, 2347; *nient*, 2293, *nient*, 2548; *seur* = *sëur*, 2638, but *ëust*, 765, *säülates*, 1845; *fïereit*, 2545; *excusation*, 2757, *nascion*, 2875, *passion*, 2875, *subjectiun*, 835; but *religion*, 2847, *dilectiun*, 918; *senefia*, 838, etc., etc.—Line 78. The common scribal substitution of one *l* for two. Read: *Ne mes k'il [l] eit tot desservi*.—Line 97. *Plus tost* for *plustost*.—Line 171. The editor's correction is unnecessary and gives one syllable over. Read with the manuscript: *Et se tu le les, lerra tei*.—Line 219. The reading of C, *E encore*, seems better.—Line 236. *Tu deiz parler plus e sovent*; read [*Que*] *tu deiz parler plus (e) sovent*?—Line 254. Semicolon.—Line 281. Comma after *grant*.—Line 298. Comma.—Line 361. The *l* of *de[l]* is unnecessary.—Line 369. Colon.—Line 435. Semicolon.—Line 491. *Ker qui autre [si] het a tort*. In view of the *si* in the next line, [*si*]

is a poor emendation. *re* would be the syllable most naturally omitted, being mistaken by the scribe for a repetition of the end of the word *autre*, and *rehet* indicates the correlation of the actions of the two parties.—Line 499. ms. P has *Se vos eu ami*; C: *Si vos avez eu .1. ami*; the editor emends: *Se vos avez en ui (IN ODIO!) ami*; read *Se vos avez un enemi*.—Line 511. P: *Kil vos veit*; C: *Kil vos fet*; editor: *Ke il vos feit*; emend: *K'il le vos fet*.—Line 671. Read *Ainz (l')aresone l'envius*, omitting *l'*, since the context shows that *l'envius* is the object.—Lines 879–880. The editor's radical emendation of the text will not bear even a preliminary test, since it gives a syllable too many in 880. It is useless for others to attempt a reconstitution, since the reading for this passage in the second manuscript is not placed at our disposal. Lines 915–918. *Encore en autre leu nos enseigne e aprent—Dont [ne] gueres de garde ne se donent la gent—Que d'(e) euvre e de parole le commençal esguart Hom ke l'en puet avoir, seit il tost, seit il tart*. The translation given in the note is not satisfactory. *soi doner garde de* is not “se garder de,” but “faire attention à,” “se soucier de.” *Hom* is subject of *esguart*, and *ke l'en puet avoir* cannot be “de celui que l'on peut avoir (pour ami).” If the reading stands it must mean “le commencement que l'on peut avoir.” Farther on in the note read *et puis que* for *et puisque*.—Lines 925–927. *Vos veez meint parole qui sa reisun n'entent, Quant il vient a la fin, donc ne vaut el neient. Dont le commençal (fu) pris[t] ne de quei ne de qui*, etc. *Meint parole* is evidently wrong; *meint parler* would render the construction normal, but in either case 927 remains without grammatical or logical connection. C supplies a reading for the two lines much nearer to the thought, which simplifies the construction and must almost certainly be used in arriving at the original. Perhaps: *Kar meint hom molt parole bien al comencement, Quant il vient a la fin que donc un point n'entent Dont*, etc.—Line 980. *reste*, read *rest(e)*. Line 1000. Comma for semicolon.—Line 1001. The *s* in *fors de[s]* *denz* is unnecessary.—Line 1006. Semicolon for comma.—Line 1120, note. The alternative reading suggested will not stand, and is unnecessary, since the use of *escoutez*, past part., obl. plu., referring to *vos*, used of a single person, needs no explanation for an author so careless of his de-

clension.—Line 1214, note. *Des amis vet tot ensement, Ice saches qui bien l'entent* needs no emendation but simply a comma after *saches*; cf. *V. B.*, I<sup>2</sup>, p. 119.—Line 1323, note. The contrast in ll. 1323–1326 is not necessarily illogical. Hope of reward that is sure (because well-merited) is contrasted with hope that is unmerited.

Line 1466. *Donc lessies le menacier* is one syllable short. The 2 plur. *lessiës* would be remarkable here between *tu* of the preceding and *te* of the following line. The correct reading *lai ester* is suggested by C; cf. l. 171.—Line 1519. *Mes que il dit verité*: change *dit* to *dise*. Construction and meter unite in demanding the subjunctive.—Lines 1538–46. In the vocabulary *premiere* is given as “la principale chose”, with a reference to this passage. *Premiere* is in reality an adjective (sc. *nature* from 1536). The editor unnecessarily tortures l. 1545 in the notes. Read with C: *La dereine* (cf. l. 613) *tient la premiere* (sc. with both adjectives *nature*).—Line 1607. Semicolon for comma.—Line 1636. *l'ame si tue*, read *se tue*.—Line 1671. *Mes salve ton ennor garder*. This would be a very early example of *honneur* as masculine, or of *ton* before feminines, and the former hypothesis is excluded, for *honneur* occurs in the line immediately preceding as feminine. Restore the normal form to *salve* and put the tonic pronoun: *Mes salf la toe ennor garder*; cf. *la meie amor*, 1827.—Line 1686. *ai* is no doubt a misprint.—Line 1718. [*le*] *sun saint plesir*; read *suen*. Cf. Meyer-Lubke, *Gram.*, III, § 168.—Line 1747. Better, comma instead of period and then period at end of 1751.—Lines 1751, 1772, etc. *en droit* should be written as one word.—Line 1774. *De(l) boen dreit jugeür*. The *l* should not be cut out. Read *suen*?—Line 1828. *Quant por la meie amor Vos requis(t) le menor*. The *t* should not be cut out; *le menor* is subject. The lines are a paraphrase of *quandiu non fecistis uni de minoribus his, nec mihi fecistis* (Matt. xxv, 45) and have no connection with Luke xii, 26, cited in the footnote. Cf. also ll. 1865–68.—Line 1830. Read *l'essor* for *lessor*.—Lines 1853–54. Substitute the *les* of ms. C in both lines for the *le* referring to *dras*.—Line 1866. Move comma to end of 1867.—Line 1883. Read *por* for *par*.—Line 1896. *Eüns* (i. e. *ayons*) *en l'erité* can hardly be correct. Read *Entruns* (subjunctive)?—Line 2165. *Ke le*

*plus trehent la cordele.* It is unnecessary to give here a figurative interpretation to *cordele* as is done in the notes and vocabulary, and that given, "compagnie, bande", is not suited to the passage.—Line 2320. *tuen*, read *suen*.—Line 2343. Does the dotted line indicate a lacuna, and if so was it indicated in the manuscript? The construction does not render it necessary to assume one.—Line 2350. Comma at end and cut out comma after *travail*.—Line 2354.—Read *porras* for *poeras*.—Line 2368. *Ne trop afie[s] a ton savoir.* Is *s* a misprint or has the editor voluntarily thrown a surplus syllable into the line? The correct subjunctive of *fier* has the necessary number of syllables.—Line 2379. Comma for period, since *qui*, 2380, *la*, 2381, 2383, all refer to *folie*.—Lines 2420–21. Put comma after 2419, cut out the comma after 2420, and change period to comma, 2422. The *que* in 2420 is not repeated by the *que* in 2421, as stated in the vocabulary, but by the *que* in 2423. The *sachiez* is then put in parenthetically, or rather there is a change of construction due to the distance of *que cil le gaberont* from *d'une rien puet estre cert.* The central idea is not that all his neighbors will hate him, but that, having won the hate of all his neighbors, even those to whom he addressed his slanders, will ridicule him.—Lines 2476 ff. I am unable to interpret these lines, but the editor's translation: "La vie cherche à nous engouffrer, cette vie qui est vaine a desirer (*sic!*) ici en comparaison de la certaine etc." is certainly far afield. If I could cite any early example of *enjôler* in the figurative sense, I should read: *Nos quiert (a) engeoler*, and translate: "It (*fol desir*) seeks to entrap us into desiring the present life, which is vain, rather than", etc.—Lines 2518, 2575. Except in diplomatic reproductions of a manuscript, *aueront*, *deuerum* should be written *avront*, *devrum*.—Line 2531, note. "*Tot = tost?*" By no means. *Tot le cors* = "au grand galop".—Lines 2664–65. *Gard k'en (ta) juvente fet aiez Tel ren que par honor retraiez.* If the editor thinks the text of C too corrupt to permit in all cases an attempt to restore the readings in that part of the poem lacking in P, it might at least be expected that attention would be called to verses left with an improper number of syllables. Nor is *gard*, 2664, 2704, subjunctive for imperative, as stated on p. 24,

since this would be *garz*. For *gard* read *garde*; the *z* of *aiez*, *retraiez* is for *s*, which gives both lines the proper number of syllables.

GLOSSARY. **A**, 89: translate "pour", as in *avoir a*, and not "comme un."—**Asez**, read 239 for 293.—**Celement**, read *celeement* and translate as an adverb.—**Charier** is three syllables; read *charjer* = *chargier*.—**De**. *d'une denree*, 119, rather than specification should be said to express measure.—**Demander**, 1297, does not mean "être prié", but is the infinitive taken substantively.—**Demorant**. *quei qu'augent demorant*, 2557, is neither "quand déjà vieux" nor "quoiqu'encore vivant", but *n'importe combien ils s'attardent*.—**Dormant**, 155, read 150. It is misleading to give *dormant* as an adjective "adonné au sommeil"; *dormant* is the present participle in its usual meaning forming with *seies* the periphrastic form.—**Element**. The editor surely has no intention of saying that *element* is not common enough in the Latin meaning; cf. Godefroy, *Comp.*, s. v.—**Emperdre** and **Encuidier** should be omitted; in the text stand correctly *en pert*, *en cuide*.—**En**. The remark to 2314 has no place in a section devoted to the preposition *en*.—**Enginnier**, 357 (read 356) is not "arranger" but *tromper*.—**Enpleier**, 2291, is not "réussir", but has its usual meaning, the object being omitted as is frequent when infinitives are used substantively; cf. *V. B.*, II, 85 n.—**Fin** in the meaning given should be omitted; cf. *errata*.—**Forslignier**, 2039. The following *par gentil* indicates that the definition "quitter les (mauvaises) traditions et habitudes de son lignage", is incorrect. Perhaps it would be better to read *forsl[o]ignie*; cf. the examples in Godefroy, s. v.—**Guarnir**. Read *word*, *heed* for *ward*, *hied*.—**Planier**, read *planier*.—**Que**. The references to 1655, 2410, 2518, 2254, 1118–19 seem to be typographical errors. The translation "comme un" for *que* in the construction *faire que fols* is syntactically misleading. In 271–273 the *que* has no double function.—**Repouvoir**, 966. The *re-* is "de son côté" as in *restre*, 100, 980.—**Sorfactus**, read *sorfaïtus*.—**Sonate**, read *souate*.—**Sorfet**, 1175, read 1174.—**Soudee**, "qui est venu subitement". Has the editor examples of this meaning in French or is it simply assumed from the Latin and Catalan?—**Tant**, 1223, read 1224.

The editing of texts is a work demanding such

wide experience and information that selecting it as a subject for doctors' dissertations should be discouraged. A dissertation represents as a rule the trial work of a beginner, who can do justice neither to the text nor to himself. We can congratulate Miss Young, however, on the extensive study and reading shown by her edition, and shall look with interest to what may come in future from her pen.

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

### SPANISH LITERATURE.

A. MOREL-FATIO, *Fernán Caballero d'après sa correspondance avec Antoine de Latour* (Extrait du Bulletin hispanique, July-Sept., 1901), Bordeaux and Paris, 1901.

At the request of the nephew of Antoine de Latour, M. Morel-Fatio has undertaken to classify the letters that form the Spanish part of the correspondence of that French littérateur. In the present article he presents a summary of the contents of some hundreds of letters sent to Latour by the Spanish novelist, Cecilia Böhl von Faber, who is best known by her pseudonym of Fernán Caballero, and in doing this he gives us much new information not to be found in the accounts of Fernán Caballero's life and works already published by F. de Gabriel and J. M. Asensio. Before giving an analysis of the letters to Latour, M. Morel-Fatio stresses the importance, for a biographical study of the Spanish authoress, of the correspondence that passed between her father, Nicolás Böhl von Faber, and various members of the Campe family, for in his epistles to the Campes, Nicolás constantly speaks of his gifted daughter.

Fernán Caballero's literary tendencies were inherited from both her father and mother, for while the former is noted for the part which he, a German, played in Spain by reviving interest in the drama of Calderón and by publishing his *Floresta de rimas antiguas castellanas*, the latter, a Spaniard of Irish ancestry, is known to have made a translation of Byron's *Manfred*. Of her mother, Fernán Caballero has little to say in her letters, but she speaks with pride of her father and

the work accomplished by him. This feeling with respect to her father is seen well exemplified in two letters now preserved in the Public Library of Boston, Mass., in which at the instance of George Ticknor, she discusses the part played by her father in certain literary quarrels. M. Morel-Fatio gives an extract from these letters, of which copies were furnished him by the Librarian of the Boston Public Library. In accordance with the principles recommended by Taine, M. Morel-Fatio seeks to discover the different influences of race, training and surroundings in the development of the future novelist, and he finds that from her German father she derived her sentimentalism, her feeling for order and method, her practical good sense and her customary mental balance, while to her mother she owed her ardent faith and piety, her intense Catholicism, and her hatred for Napoleonic France. Her early training under a French-speaking governess and in a French boarding-school at Hamburg, as well as her great fondness for the French novel, explain the appreciable influence of French methods on her literary development. In her very first work, a novel written in German as early as 1833, she adopted much of the manner of the current French *roman-feuilleton*, although her realistic tendencies were also there visible. Strangely enough, she seems to have been but imperfectly acquainted with the earlier literature of Spain.

The correspondence with Antoine de Latour extended over a period of twenty years, from 1856 to 1876. It reveals at once the fact that the spirits of the two were closely akin, conservative alike in religion and politics, and that Latour was the literary guide and counsellor of the Spanish writer. She makes him her confidant in everything, now chafing against the contentions of reviewers who claimed her for Germany when she meant to be deemed a Simon-pure Spaniard, and again giving him ample descriptions of certain members of her family. She has much to say about her married life, dealing especially with her third husband, the ill-starred Arrom. A clipping from an English newspaper, preserved by Latour, gives an account of Arrom's suicide, and makes it clear that he was insane when he took his own life. Of the sad period that followed for Fernán Caballero, and of her later experiences in the Alcázar, the letters afford a detailed record. Not the least interesting